

### REMARKS

The claims remaining in the present application are Claims 1-19. The Examiner is thanked for performing a thorough search. The only amendment made in this response was to fix an antecedent basis problem in Claim 11. No new matter has been amended Applicants respectfully point out, that the amendment would not cause a new search to be performed and therefore a final rejection for the next Office Action would be improper.

### THE OFFICE ACTION'S FORMAT

The Office Action dated December 6, 2006 does not clearly correlate portions of the cited reference to the Claims, which makes it difficult for Applicants to respond to the Office Action. Applicants respectfully request that the next Office Action list the claims, list the limitations under each of the claims, and cite portions of reference(s) for each limitation.

### OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION

In paragraph 1, the Office Action objected to the specification. The Office Action stated, "...on page 14 elements 506 and 507 are both referred to as the failed fan motor transport belt, and in addition element 503 is referred to as a pre-existing fan motor and a replacement fan motor." Applicants respectfully traverse the objection to the specification.

With respect to elements 506 and 507, the Office Action is assuming that only one motor transport belt can fail. Various embodiments teach that more than one motor transport belt can fail and therefore either or both 506 and 507 can be failed motor transport belts.

With respect to element 503, page 14 lines 7 and 8 refer to "fan motor 503" and page 14 line 20 refers to "replacement fan motor 503." Obviously, a "fan motor" can be a "replacement fan motor" and therefore referring to 503 as a fan motor in one place and a replacement fan motor in another place is not a contradiction. Further, Applicants wish to note that the Office Action has misquoted page 14 as referring to 503 as a "pre-existing fan motor."

Therefore, Applicants believe that these objections have been addressed in light of Applicants' explanation regarding elements 506, 507 and 503.

## CLAIM REJECTIONS

### 35 U.S.C. §102

#### Claims 4, 11, and 13

In paragraph 3, the Office Action rejected Claims 4, 11 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. The Office Action asserted that Claims 4 and 13 recited “substantially different power characteristics.” Claim 4 does not recite “substantially different...” However, Claim 6 does. Therefore, Applicants shall assume that the Office Action intended to rejection Claims 6 and 13.

Applicants traverse the Office Action’s rejection of Claims 6 and 13 for reciting “substantially different...” MPEP 2173.05(b)D states that the term “substantially” is definite because one of ordinary skill in the art would know what was meant by “substantially.”

Applicants have amended Claim 11. Therefore, Applicants believe that that these rejections have been addressed.

### 35 U.S.C. §102

#### Claims 1-19

Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,791,209 by Aldridge et al. (referred to hereinafter as “Aldridge”). Applicants respectfully submit that embodiments of the present invention are neither taught nor suggested by Aldridge.

Claim 1 recites,

A fan motor assembly with integrated redundant availability, said fan motor assembly comprising:

    a fan motor subassembly comprising a plurality of replaceable fan motors;

    a fan motor selector mechanism coupled to said fan motor subassembly, said fan motor selector mechanism configured to selectively engage one of said plurality of replaceable fan motors to a fan; and

    a control unit coupled to said fan motor selector mechanism, said control unit configured to control said fan motor selector mechanism such that a first of said plurality of replaceable fan motors mechanically powers said fan while a second of said plurality of replaceable fan motors can be dynamically removed from said fan motor subassembly.

Applicants respectfully submit that Aldridge does not teach or suggest, among other things, “a plurality of replaceable fan motors...a second of said plurality of replaceable fan motors can be dynamically removed from said fan motor assembly,” (emphasis added) as recited by Claim 1.

Aldridge teaches continuously having at least one power supply for a fan.  
Col. 1 lines 16-35 state,

...it is essential to dissipate the heat generated by electronic components within the system during its operation to keep the electronic components within their normal operating temperature ranges...

One effective technique for dissipating the heat from electronic components, such as a power supply, is to provide an internal fan...

Current technology for power supplies has the power supply providing power internally for the internal or attached fans. Power supplies can fail if the cooling fan fails.

Aldridge teaches a solution to the problem at Col. 3 lines 1-13, which states, In power supply set 200, power is provided for fans 140, 145 and 150 via positive system voltage source 240 and negative system voltage source 250...By using system level power to supply fans 140, 145 and 150 with power, if any of the power supplies in power supply set 200 fail, the associated power supply fan remains provided with power. Therefore, each power supply fan within power supply set 200 can each still provide fan cooling to an associated electronic device or other electronic components situated within the vicinity of the failed power supply (emphasis added).

Col. 3 lines 57-63 state,

If a power supply fails in power supply set 300, since each power supply fan in power supply set 300 has power supplied by a source external to the failed power supply, the power supply fan remains operating to provide cooling to associated electronic components or electronic components situated in the vicinity of the power supply. (emphasis added).

Therefore Col. 3 lines 1-13 describes a way of continuously supplying power to a fan even in the event of a power supply to that fan failing, which uses positive system voltage source 240 and negative system voltage source 250. Col. 3 lines 57-63 describes another way of continuously supplying power to a fan even in the event of a power supply to that fan failing, which uses an external source.

Aldridge teaches nothing about “replaceable fan motors” or dynamically removing a replaceable fan motor. Therefore, Aldridge cannot teach or suggest, among other things, “a plurality of replaceable fan motors...a second of said plurality

of replaceable fan motors can be dynamically removed from said fan motor assembly,” (emphasis added) as recited by Claim 1.

The Office Action asserted that Aldridge teaches replaceable fan motors at 175, 180, 470, 260, 270, 340... However, Aldridge does not teach replaceable fan motors. Instead Aldridge teaches continuously supplying power to a fan even in the event of a power supply to that fan failing. The Office Action asserted that Aldridge’s element 450 teaches Claim 1’s fan motor selector mechanism. However, Applicants were unable to find an element 450 in Aldridge. The Office Action asserted that Aldridge teaches “a control unit coupled to said fan motor selector mechanism, said control unit configured to control said fan motor selector mechanism such that a first of said plurality of replaceable fan motors mechanically powers said fan while a second of said plurality of replaceable fan motors can be dynamically removed from said fan motor subassembly,” as recited by Claim 1 at Col. 4 lines 62-65. Aldridge states at Col. 4 lines 62-65,

Also, fan speed control is switched to fan speed controller terminal 350. Therefore, this embodiment allows maintenance of a power supply without having to shutdown a complete system. (emphasis added).

Col. 4 lines 62-65 discusses maintaining a power supply. Col. 4 lines 62-65 does not mention “replaceable fan motors” nor does it say anything about dynamically removing a replaceable fan motor from a fan motor subassembly.

For the foregoing reasons, independent Claim 1 should be patentable. For similar reasons, independent Claims 8 and 15 should also be patentable. Claims 2-7 depend on Claim 1. Claims 9-14 depend on Claim 8. Claims 16-19 depend on Claim 15. These dependent claims include all of the limitations of their respective independent claims. Further, these dependent claims include additional limitations which further make them patentable. Therefore, these dependent claims should be patentable for at least the reasons that their respective independent claims should be patentable.

### DOUBLE PATENTING

#### Claims 1-19

In paragraph 8, Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of Claims 1-19 of prior U.S. Patent No. 6,956,344. The

Office Action states, "...the term 'same invention,' in this context, means an invention drawn to the identical subject matter" (emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully traverse the double patenting reject because the subject matter of Claims 1-19 of the instant application, application serial no. 10/699,430, is patentably distinct with regards to the subject matter of Claims 1-19 of U.S. Patent No. 6,956,344. For example, Claim 1 of the instant application recites "a plurality of replaceable fan motors...a first of said plurality of replaceable fan motors mechanically powers said fan while a second of said plurality of replaceable fan motors can be dynamically removed from said fan motor subassembly" (emphasis added). Claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,956,344 does not recite replaceable fan motors or dynamically removing a replaceable fan motor.

Therefore, Claim 1 is patentably distinct with regards to Claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,956,344. For similar reasons, respective independent Claims 8 and 15 of the instant application are patentably distinct with regards to respective independent Claims 8 and 15 of U.S. Patent No. 6,956,344. Therefore, a statutory double patenting rejection of the instant application's claims in light of U.S. Patent No. 6,956,344 is not proper and should be reversed. Claims 2-7 depend on Claim 1. Claims 9-14 depend on Claim 8. Claims 16-19 depend on Claim 15. These dependent claims include all of the limitations of their respective independent claims. Further, these dependent claims include additional limitations which further make them patentable. Therefore, these dependent claims should be patentable for at least the reasons that their respective independent claims should be patentable.

### CONCLUSION

In light of the above listed amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the rejected claims is requested. Based on the arguments and amendments presented above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-19 overcome the rejections of record. For reasons discussed herein, Applicant respectfully requests that Claims 1-19 be considered by the Examiner. Therefore, allowance of Claims 1-19 is respectfully solicited.


Should the Examiner have a question regarding the instant amendment and response, the Applicant invites the Examiner to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Dated: 3/5/, 2007

Address:

Telephone:

Respectfully submitted,  
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
John P. Wagner Jr.  
Registration No. 35,398

Westridge Business Park  
123 Westridge Drive  
Watsonville, California 95076 USA

(408) 938-9060 Voice  
(408) 234-3749 Direct/Cell  
(408) 763-2895 Facsimile